

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The title of the invention is objected to as not descriptive. The new title is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Objection is made to the recitation of the term “characterized” in claim 1. This terminology has been changed. The term “characterized” has also been changed in claim 16.

Objection is made to the recitation of “the said” in claims 1, 2, and 3. This terminology has been changed.

Objection is made to the recitation of “the location means” in claim 4. This terminology has been changed. This terminology has also been changed in Claims 8, 13 and 15.


Claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lomax (U.S. Patent No. 6,220,290). Claim 1, as amended, is allowable because it has been rewritten to include the limitations of what was previously Claim 6, and the resulting claim was found to be allowable subject matter. Claims 2, 7, 9, 11 and 12, as amended, are allowable because these claims are dependant on Claim 1, and therefore are not anticipated by the Lomax patent.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 10 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Lomax in view of Rainwater et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,696). As amended 3, 4, 8, 10 are allowable because these claims are dependant on claim 1, which, as amended, is allowable subject matter.

Claims 13-16, as amended, are allowable because these claims have been rewritten to include the limitations of what was previously Claim 6.

Claim 5, as amended, is allowable because it has been rewritten to incorporate the text of what was previously Claim 1, and the resulting claim was found to be allowable subject matter.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
John V. Moriarty, Reg. No. 26,207  
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty,  
McNett & Henry LLP  
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137  
(317) 634-3456